





## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.                              | FILING DATE    | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR    | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |  |
|--|----------------|-------------------------|---------------------|------------------|--|
| 09/090,035                                   | 06/10/1998     | MARTIN HAUPT            | PHD97-074           | 3465             |  |
| 7  | 590 07/16/2002 |                         |                     |                  |  |
| U S PHILIPS CORPORATION                      |                |                         | EXAMINER            |                  |  |
| 580 WHITE PLAINS ROAD<br>TARRYTOWN, NY 10591 |                |                         | KUPSTAS             | KUPSTAS, TOD A   |  |
|  |                |                         | ART UNIT            | PAPER NUMBER     |  |
|  |                |                         | 2153                |                  |  |
|  |                | DATE MAILED: 07/16/2002 |                     |                  |  |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

m

|  | Application No.   | Applicant(s)  |  |  |  |
|--|---|---|--|--|--|
| Advisory Action  | 09/090,035  | HAUPT ET AL.  |  |  |  |
| Advisory Action  | Examiner  | Art Unit  |  |  |  |
|  | Tod Kupstas   | 2153  |  |  |  |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address  |   |   |  |  |  |
| THE REPLY FILED 02 July 2002 FAILS TO PLACE TH Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appe Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.   | void abandonment of this application (1) a timely filed amendment whi   | cation. A proper reply to a<br>ch places the application in   |  |  |  |
| PERIOD FOR RE  | EPLY [check either a) or b)]  |   |  |  |  |
| a) The period for reply expires 3_months from the mailing date of b)  The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adverse, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).  Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The dath have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exten 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three moterned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | risory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THI te on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 sion and the corresponding amount of the statutory period for reply originally set in | f the final rejection.  E FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP  36(a) and the appropriate extension fee of the appropriate extension fee under the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in |  |  |  |
| 1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.   |   |   |  |  |  |
| 2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered b   | ecause:   |   |  |  |  |
| (a) They raise new issues that would require furth   | er consideration and/or search (  | see NOTE below);  |  |  |  |
| (b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note I   | • •   | ,   |  |  |  |
| (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or   | in better form for appeal by mat  | erially reducing or simplifying the   |  |  |  |
| (d)  they present additional claims without cancel<br>NOTE:  | ing a corresponding number of   | finally rejected claims.  |  |  |  |
| 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejec  | tion(s):  |   |  |  |  |
| 4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).  | be allowable if submitted in a s  | eparate, timely filed amendment   |  |  |  |
| 5.☑ The a)☐ affidavit, b)☐ exhibit, or c)☑ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .  |   |   |  |  |  |
| The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.  |   |   |  |  |  |
| 7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we  |   |   |  |  |  |
| The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:   |   |   |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) allowed:  |   |   |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) objected to:  |   |   |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) rejected:   |   |   |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:   |   |   |  |  |  |
| 8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is   | a)☐ approved or b)☐ disapp  | proved by the Examiner.   |  |  |  |
| 9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme  | nt(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s)  | <u> </u>  |  |  |  |
| 10. Other:   |   | BRIAN E. MILLER PRIMARY EXAMINER  |  |  |  |

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTO-303 (Rev. 04-01) Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues that the 103 rejection utilizes improper hindsight. The Examiner maintains that the 103 rejection is proper as the combination of Shindo in view of Nakamichi renders the arrangement of the respective positions in the ejection and reproduction of discs as obvious.